UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/750,028	12/30/2003	Brian R. Meyers	MS304770.01 / MSFTP501US	9173

27195 7590 11/28/2008

AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP
127 Public Square
57th Floor, Key Tower
CLEVELAND, OH 44114

EXAMINER	
SHIN, KYUNG H	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2443	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
11/28/2008	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

docket1@thepatentattorneys.com
hholmes@thepatentattorneys.com
lpasterchek@thepatentattorneys.com

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/750,028	MEYERS ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Kyung Hye Shin	2443	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *14 November 2008*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1 - 3, 5, 11, 13 - 19, 26 - 32* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1 - 3, 5, 11, 13 - 19, 26 - 32* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 11/14/08 has been entered.

2. Claims **1 - 3, 5, 11, 13 - 19, 26 - 32** are pending. Claims **1 - 3, 5, 11, 13 - 15** have been amended. Claims **4, 6 - 10, 12, 20 - 25, 33 - 40** have been cancelled.

Claims 1, 13, 20, 32 are independent. This application was filed on **12-30-2003**.

- Claim 5 objection from Final has been withdrawn due to claim amendment.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

4. Claims **1, 19, 28, 32** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed,

had possession of the claimed invention. There is no disclosure or definition of the term "proximate" in the specification. The term is mentioned in the original claims. But, there is insufficient disclosure to determine what is meant by the term "proximate". The term "proximate" is defined as :" very close in space or time" (http://www.thefreedictionary.com/proximate). Are the computing systems close in space or time? Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

5. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

> Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

6. Claims **1-3, 5, 11, 13-19, 32** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to **non-statutory** subject matter. Amended claims with "computer-implemented system..." don't meet the conditions of 101 requirements, thus 35 USC § 101 rejections are maintained.

In Claims **1, 13, 32** "a *device comprising a local agent* ***component..***" is to be construed as computing device of *software per se*, embodying functional descriptive material, *unless* agent component claimed in combination with an appropriate *computer readable medium* to enable the functionality to be realized is patent eligible subject matter, and if it is capable of producing a useful, concrete and tangible result when used in the computer system. (See MPEP 2106, subsection IV. C.) It needs to be clear in specification that the only reasonable interpretation of the word "component" is limited

to hardware inclusive, tangible embodiment. According to the specification, it is possible for the corresponding disclosed "component" to cover an embodiment of software alone. (spec. para 32).

> [0032] As used in this application, the terms "component" and "system" are intended to refer to a computer-related entity, either hardware, a combination of hardware and software, software, or software in execution. For example, a component may be, but is not limited to being, a process running on a processor, a processor, an object, an executable, a thread of execution, a program, and/or a computer. By way of illustration, both an application running on a server and the server can be a component. One or more components may reside within a process and/or thread of execution and a component may be localized on one computer and/or distributed between two or more computers.

Appropriate correction is required.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments filed 11-14-2008 have been fully considered but are moot based on new grounds of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claims **1 - 3, 5, 13 - 17, 19** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over **Paroz** (US Patent No. **6,587,125**) in view of **Kawamura et al.** (US Patent No. **6,662,207**).

Regarding Claim 1, Paroz discloses a computer-implemented system that facilitates controlling a computing device, comprising a local agent component that receives local input device data of one or more local input devices of a local system and routes the local input device data to a remote system for the control thereof with the one or more local input devices such that the local system control of the remote system by the user via the local agent upon deployment of the remote system proximate to the local system; (Paroz col 5, ll 30-35: software (mediation) components; sends updated information about the state of first computing device (remote) to second computing device (local); col 5, ll 41-45: receives control input from said mediation system (communicates with local) and executes it on first computing device (remote); control first computing device (remote) from second computing device (local); col 5, ll 17-23: remotely controlling a first computing device from a second computing device; local (second) system controls remote (first) system) and a processor for executing the computer executable local agent component. (Paroz col 7, ll 42-46: second computing system (local) can be a personal computer; implies a processor for system operations)

Paroz does not explicitly disclose that the local agent is communicatively coupled to an associations database comprising associations information between a user, the local system, and the remote system. However, Kawamura discloses wherein the local agent of the local system is communicatively coupled to an associations database comprising associations information between a user, the local system, and the remote system. (Kawamura col 6, l 65 - col 7, l 6: information stored in agent profile (agent attributes); information with regard to whether individual platforms are capable of

accepting and activating an agent; col 32, ll 23-31: storage of platform profile and agent profile; can be stored in a centralized or distributed manner (agent profile for each agent is part of each agent or in a central store))

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Paroz where the local agent of the local system is communicatively coupled to an associations database comprising associations information between a user, the local system, and the remote system as taught by Kawamura. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to employ the teachings of Kawamura in order to perform highly efficient information processing that is responsive to changes in situation. (see Kawamura col 6, ll 36-43: "*... Therefore, an object of the present invention is to provide an agent system that, when it is necessary for an agent to perform some task at another node, is capable of dynamically judging at that point, based on the situations at that time, whether to move the agent or have the agent cooperate. Given such an agent system, it is possible to perform highly efficient information processing that is responsive to changes in situation. ...*")

Regarding Claim 2, Paroz discloses the computer-implemented system of claim 1, the computer executable local agent component further receives remote system data associated with the remote system that is processed to determine whether to route the local input device data to the remote system. (Paroz col 5, ll 17-23: second (local) system controls first (remote) system; col 5, ll 30-35: mediator (local agent) receives control input; col 5, ll 41-45: receives control input and executes (routes) on first

computing device (remote))

Regarding Claim 3, Paroz discloses the computer-implemented system of claim 1, the local input device data is used by the remote system along with remote input device data of one or more remote input devices to facilitate control of the remote system, using at least one of the one or more local input devices, the one or more remote input devices, and a combination of one or more of the local and remote input devices. (Paroz col 5, ll 17-23: a system for controlling a first computing device (remote) from a second computing device (local); col 5, ll 30-35: sends updated information about the state of first computing device to equivalent or second computing device)

Regarding Claim 5, Paroz discloses the computer-implemented system of claim 1, further comprising a computer executable remote agent component of the remote system signals the local agent component, in response to which the local agent component disengages control of the remote system via the one or more local input devices by routing the local input device data for processing only by the local system. (Paroz col 9, ll 39-44: visual status monitor monitors GUI events; determine whether to generate a message to the mediator for the second computing device (local); col 9, ll 21-25: handlers for events received from local program; handlers for events occurring on second computing device)

Regarding Claim 13, Paroz discloses a computer-implemented system that facilitates

control of a second computing system with a first computing system, comprising:

a first computer executable agent programmed on the first computing system that receives local input device data of a local input device; (Paroz col 5, ll 30-35: mediation system (communicates with local agent); receives control input from second computing system (first agent))

a second computer executable agent of the second computing system that communicates with the first computer executable agent to facilitate control of the second computing system, the local input device triggers routing of the local input device data by the first computer executable agent to the second computer executable agent. (Paroz col 4, ll 61-65: software component on first computing device (second agent) monitors input events from second computing device (first agent); col 5, ll 17-23: second (local) system controls first (remote) system; col 5, ll 30-35: mediator (local agent) receives control input; col 5, ll 41-45: receives control input and executes (routes) on first computing device (remote))

a processor for executing the first computer executable agent. (Paroz col 7, ll 42-46: second computing system (local) can be a personal computer; implies a processor for system operations)

Regarding Claim 14, Paroz discloses the computer-implemented system of claim 13, the computer executable first agent routes the local input device data based upon a location of a pointer associated with at least one of the first computing system and the second computing system, the pointer location coinciding with switching area of a user

interface that triggers the first computer executable agent to route the input device data. (Paroz col 5, ll 17-23: second (local) system controls first (remote) system; col 5, ll 30-35: mediator (local agent) receives control input; col 5, ll 41-45: receives control input and executes (routes) on first computing device (remote))

Regarding Claim 15, Paroz discloses the computer-implemented system of claim 14, the switching area is determined manually by a user that configures the physical orientation of the second computing system to the first computing system, in response to which at least one of the switching area is determined on a display of the first computing system and second switching area is determined on a display of the second computing system. (Paroz col 9, ll 39-44: visual status monitor monitors GUI events (mouse clicks, window focus); determine whether to generate a message to the mediator for the second computing device (local); col 9, ll 21-25: handlers for events received from local program; handlers for events occurring on second computing device)

Regarding Claim 16, Paroz discloses the computer-implemented system of claim 14, the switching area is determined automatically by automatically determining the physical orientation of the second computing system to the first computing system, in response to which the first computer executable agent determines placement of the switching area on a display of the first computing system. (Paroz col 9, ll 39-44: visual status monitor monitors GUI events (mouse clicks, window focus); determine whether to

generate a message to the mediator for the second computing device (local); col 9, ll 21-25: handlers for events received from local program; handlers for events occurring on second computing device)

Regarding Claim 17, Paroz discloses the computer-implemented system of claim 13, the first computer executable agent routes the local input device data based upon location of a pointer associated with a remote input device of the second computing system, the pointer location matching a location of a display element of the second computing system that triggers the second agent to signal the first computer executable agent to route the input device data to the first computing local system only. (Paroz col 5, ll 17-23: second (local) system controls first (remote) system; col 5, ll 30-35: mediator (local agent) receives control input; col 5, ll 41-45: receives control input and executes (routes) on first computing device (remote))

Regarding Claim 19, Paroz discloses the system of claim 13, the first computer executable agent of the first computing system is coupled to a database of associations between a user, the first computing system, and the second computing system such that deployment of the second computing system proximate the first computing system automatically facilitates control of the second computing system by the user via the first computing system. (Paroz col 9, ll 39-44: visual status monitor monitors GUI events (mouse clicks, window focus); determine whether to generate a message to the mediator for the second computing device (local); col 9, ll 21-25: handlers for events

received from local program; handlers for events occurring on second computing device)

10. Claim **11** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Paroz-Kawamura** and further in view of **Deshpande** (US Patent No. **7,171,444**).

Regarding Claim 11, Paroz discloses the system of claim 1, the local computer executable agent component facilitates an interface on the local system to control the remote system. (Paroz col 5, ll 17-23: a system for controlling a first computing device (remote) from a second computing device (local); col 5, ll 37-40: visual status monitoring system (display, user interface) detects changes in the status of first computing system (remote) and transfers those changes to second computing device (local)) Paroz does not explicitly disclose a touch pad interface. However, Deshpande discloses emulation of a touch pad interface. (Deshpande col 1, ll 23-27: touch screen)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Paroz to use a touch pad interface as taught by Deshpande. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to employ the teachings of Deshpande in order to provide adequate playback by eliminating bandwidth constraints. (Deshpande col 2, ll 42-47: " *... Many thin client systems fail to achieve adequate playback due to the bandwidth constraints and the way in which that bandwidth is used. The present invention addresses this and other problems associated with the prior art. ...* ")

11. Claims **18, 32** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Paroz-Kawamura and further in view of **Beged-Dov et al.** (US Patent No. **6,983,328**).

Regarding Claim 18, Paroz discloses the computer-implemented system of claim 13, the first computer executable agent facilitates copying data from the first computing system to the second computing system by encapsulating data and transmitting the encapsulated data to the second computer executable agent. (Paroz col 5, ll 17-23: a system for controlling a first computing device (remote) from a second computing device (local); col 5, ll 30-35: sends updated information about the state of first computing device to equivalent or second computing device) Paroz does not explicitly disclose copying of clipboard data from the first computing system to the second computing system. However, Beged-Dov discloses copying of clipboard data from the first computing system to the second computing system by encapsulating the clipboard data and transmitting the encapsulated clipboard data, verifies that the clipboard data can be copied to the second computing system. (Beged-Dov col 3 l 63 - col 4, l 2: using a clipboard for copy and paste; col 4, ll 39-50: copy function; col 5, ll 36-49: past function; col 3 l 63 - col 4, l 2: using a clipboard for copy and paste; col 4, ll 30-33: verifies user identity at copy system (first system); col 5, ll 17-18: verifies user identity at paste system (second system))

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Paroz to copy clipboard data from the first computing system to the second computing system as taught by Beged-Dov. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to employ the teachings of Beged-Dov in order for a method and system to facilitate the efficient and secure transfer of resources. (Beged-Dov col 1, ll 19-20; col 2, ll 4-6)

Regarding Claim 32, Paroz discloses a system that facilitates controlling a computing system, comprising:

means for providing an agent for a first system, which agent receives input device data of one or more input devices of the first system; (Paroz col 5, ll 17-23: second (local) system controls first (remote) system; col 5, ll 30-35: mediator (local agent) receives control input)

means for signaling the agent to route the input device data to at least a second system; (Paroz col 5, ll 17-23: second (local) system controls first (remote) system; col 5, ll 30-35: mediator (local agent) receives control input; col 5, ll 41-45: receives control input and executes (routes) on first computing device (remote))

means for routing the input device data to the second system for processing; (Paroz col 5, ll 41-45: receives control input and executes (routes) on first computing device (remote))

means for presenting objects displayed by the second system, on a display of the first system; (Paroz col 7, ll 16-23: monitors the user interface output from the local program and sends appropriate output to the remote computing device)

means for controlling the second system via the display of the first system. (Paroz col 7, ll 16-23: monitors the user interface output from the local program and sends appropriate output to the remote computing device)

Paroz discloses wherein a user thereof to automatically facilitate control of the

second system via the first system upon deployment of the second system proximate to the first system. (Paroz col 5, ll 17-23: a system for controlling a first computing device (remote) from a second computing device (local); col 5, ll 30-35: sends updated information about the state of first computing device to equivalent or second computing device; col 5, ll 41-45: receives control input and executes (routes) on first computing device (remote)) Paroz does not explicitly disclose that the local agent is communicatively coupled to an associations database comprising associations information between a user, the local system, and the remote system However, Kawamura discloses:

means for accessing a database of associations between the first system, at least a second system; (Kawamura col 6, l 65 - col 7, l 6: information stored in agent profile (agent attributes); information with regard to whether individual platforms are capable of accepting and activating an agent; col 32, ll 23-31: storage of platform profile and agent profile; can be stored in a centralized or distributed manner (agent profile for each agent is part of each agent or in a central store))

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Paroz where the local agent of the local system is communicatively coupled to an associations database comprising associations information between a user, the local system, and the remote system as taught by Kawamura. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to employ the teachings of Kawamura in order to perform highly efficient information processing that is responsive to changes in situation. (see Kawamura col 6, ll 36-43)

Paroz does not explicitly disclose automatically routing clipboard content from the first system to the at least a second system, the second system including a second agent that verifies that the clipboard content can be received at the second system. However, Beged-Dov discloses:

means for automatically routing clipboard content from the first system to the at least a second system, the at least a second system including a second agent that verifies that the clipboard content can be received at the at least a second system. (Beged-Dov col 3 l 63 - col 4, l 2: using a clipboard for copy and paste; col 4, ll 39-50: copy function; col 5, ll 36-49: past function; col 3 l 63 - col 4, l 2: using a clipboard for copy and paste; col 4, ll 30-33: verifies user identity at copy system (first system); col 5, ll 17-18: verifies user identity at paste system (second system))

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Paroz to receiving clipboard data and switching clipboard data to a second computing system as taught by Beged-Dov. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to employ the teachings of Beged-Dov in order for a method and system to facilitate the efficient and secure transfer of resources. (Beged-Dov col 1, ll 19-20; col 2, ll 4-6)

12. Claims **26 - 31** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Paroz** in view of **Beged-Dov**.

Regarding Claim 26, Paroz discloses a method for controlling a computer, the method comprising: receiving at least one of input device data and associated with a first agent of a first computing system, programmed to receive and switch the at least one of input device data (Paroz col 4, ll 56-60: software component (first agent) on first computing device monitors events from the first computing device); and switching at least one of the input device data to a second computing system based upon the input device data. (Paroz col 5, ll 17-23: second (local) system controls first (remote) system; col 5, ll 30-35: mediator (local agent) receives control input; col 5, ll 41-45: receives control input and executes (routes) on first computing device (remote)) Paroz does not explicitly disclose receiving clipboard data and switching clipboard data to a second computing system. However, Beged-Dov discloses receiving clipboard data and switching clipboard data to a second computing system; and routing the clipboard data to the second computing system in response to a routine signal. (Beged-Dov col 3 l 63 - col 4, l 2: using a clipboard for copy and paste; col 4, ll 39-50: copy function; col 5, ll 36-49: past function; col 3 l 63 - col 4, l 2: using a clipboard for copy and paste)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Paroz to receiving clipboard data and switching clipboard data to a second computing system as taught by Beged-Dov. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to employ the teachings of Beged-Dov in order for a method and system to facilitate the efficient and secure transfer of resources. (Beged-Dov col 1, ll 19-20; col 2, ll 4-6)

Regarding Claim 27, Paroz discloses the method of claim 26, further comprising a

display of the first computing system to facilitate control of the second computing system. (Paroz col 5, ll 37-40: visual status monitoring (display); detects changes in state of first computing device (second computing system) and sends those changes for transfer to second computing device (first computing device)) Paroz does not explicitly disclose a touch pad. However, Deshpande discloses a touch pad. (Deshpande col 1, ll 23-27: touch screen)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Paroz to use a touch pad as taught by Deshpande. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to employ the teachings of Deshpande in order to provide adequate playback by eliminating bandwidth constraints. (Deshpande col 2, ll 42-47)

Regarding Claim 28, Paroz discloses the method of claim 26, further comprising tracking a location of the second computing system such that placement of the second computing system proximate to the first computing system causes the first agent to automatically facilitate control of the second system. (Paroz col 9, ll 39-44: visual status monitor monitors GUI events (mouse clicks, window focus); determine whether to generate a message to the mediator for the second computing device (local); col 9, ll 21-25: handlers for events received from local program; handlers for events occurring on second computing device)

Regarding Claim 29, Paroz discloses the method of claim 26, further comprising configuring the first agent by designating one or more locations on a display screen of

the first computing system to trigger routing of the input device data to the second system, the one or more locations include at least one of a display element and an icon that are associated with triggering the first agent to route the input device data to the second computing system. (Paroz col 5, ll 17-23: second (local) system controls first (remote) system; col 5, ll 30-35: mediator (local agent) receives control input; col 5, ll 41-45: receives control input and executes (routes) on first computing device (remote); col 7, ll 1-4: analyze first computing device's user interface (GUI, display, icons); creates a equivalent second user interface and sends second user interface to second computing device; col 9, ll 21-25: handlers for events received from local program; handlers for events occurring on second computing device)

Regarding Claim 30, Paroz discloses the method of claim 26, (Paroz col 5, ll 17-23: a system for controlling a first computing device (remote) from a second computing device (local)) Paroz does not explicitly disclose the routing of the clipboard data includes encapsulating the clipboard data and transmitting the encapsulated clipboard data to the second computing system. However, Beged-Dov discloses wherein the routing of the clipboard data includes encapsulating the clipboard data and transmitting the encapsulated clipboard data to the second computing system. (Beged-Dov col 3 l 63 - col 4, l 2: using a clipboard for copy and paste; col 4, ll 39-50: copy function; col 5, ll 36-49: past function; col 3 l 63 - col 4, l 2: using a clipboard for copy and paste)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Paroz to receiving clipboard data and switching clipboard data to a second computing system as

taught by Beged-Dov. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to employ the teachings of Beged-Dov in order for a method and system to facilitate the efficient and secure transfer of resources. (Beged-Dov col 1, ll 19-20; col 2, ll 4-6)

Regarding Claim 31, Paroz discloses the method of claim 26. (Paroz col 5, ll 17-23: a system for controlling a first computing device (remote) from a second computing device (local)) Paroz does not explicitly disclose authenticating the second computing system before routing the clipboard data thereto. However, Beged-Dov discloses wherein further comprising authenticating the second computing system before routing the clipboard data thereto, wherein authentication and routing are performed one of automatically and manually. (Beged-Dov col 3 l 63 - col 4, l 2: using a clipboard for copy and paste; col 4, ll 39-50: copy function; col 5, ll 36-49: past function; col 3 l 63 - col 4, l 2: using a clipboard for copy and paste; col 4, ll 30-33: verifies user identity at copy system (first system); col 5, ll 17-18: verifies user identity at paste system (second system))

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Paroz to receiving clipboard data and switching clipboard data to a second computing system as taught by Beged-Dov. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to employ the teachings of Beged-Dov in order for a method and system to facilitate the efficient and secure transfer of resources. (Beged-Dov col 1, ll 19-20; col 2, ll 4-6)

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kyung Hye Shin whose telephone number is (571) 272-3920. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:30 am - 6 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tonia L. Dollinger can be reached on (571) 272-4170. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Kyung Hye Shin
Examiner
Art Unit 2443

KHS
November 23, 2008

/Tonia LM Dollinger/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2443